REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Action issued February 6, 2009. Claims 1-18 are pending in this Application. In order to advance prosecution of this Application, Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and favorable action in this Application.

The Examiner issued a Final Action on February 6, 2009. Applicant respectfully requests continued examination of this Application so that the Examiner can reconsider the rejection of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks provided herein.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,442,557 issued to Buteau, et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,249,769 issued to Ruffin, et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,290,275 issued to Baudoin, et al. Independent Claims 1 and 18 recite in general an ability to determine by the computer information technology requirements for the business in response to the existing information technology and the relationship among the manageable entities and generate by the computer a plan for implementation and deployment of future information technology among the manageable entities based on the determined information technology requirements for display by the computer within the graphical representation of the overall architecture, wherein the plan includes a future security architecture based on the future information technology and a transition between a current security architecture and the future security architecture. By contrast, the Buteau, et al. patent merely discloses providing for the representation of an enterprise architecture to support strategic decision-making by engineers concerning future technology investment. The Examiner readily admits

that the Buteau, et al. patent provides no capability for a computer to determine information technology requirements for the business in response to the existing information technology and the relationship among the manageable entities. The Buteau, et al. patent merely provides a representation of an existing enterprise architecture and allows a user to make changes and show how the changes affect the enterprise architecture. As a result, the Buteau, et al. patent does generate any plan for implementation and deployment of future information technology among the manageable entities based on the determined information technology requirements as it does not determine information technology requirements and can only adjust its existing enterprise architecture based on user input. The Ruffin, et al. patent is cited for its disclosure of data gathering facilities that gather information processing requirements coincident with the IT system objectives of an enterprise. However, the Ruffin, et al. patent merely determines business solution deliverables including proposals for the enhancement of elements in an existing IT environment having common features. The Baudoin, et al. patent is only cited for its security architecture disclosure and has no capability to perform the capabilities provided by the claimed invention. The structure provided by the proposed Buteau, et al. - Ruffin, et al. - Baudoin, et al. combination fails to show how the security architecture of the Baudoin, et al. patent can be integrated into the data gathering facility of the Ruffin, et al. patent let alone into the representation of an existing enterprise architecture of the Buteau, et al. patent. Moreover, none of the cited patents show any capability to generate a plan that includes a future security architecture based on the future information technology and a transition between a current security architecture and the future security architecture. Therefore,

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-19 are patentably distinct from the proposed Buteau, et al. - Ruffin, et al. - Baudoin, et al. combination.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 05-0765 of Electronic Data Systems Corporation an amount of $810.00 to satisfy the request for continued examination fee of 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e).

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For at least the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference or an interview would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the undersigned attorney for Applicants stands ready to conduct such a conference at the convenience of the Examiner.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees and credit any overpayments associated with this Application to Deposit Account No. 05-0765 of Electronic Data Systems Corporation.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicants

Charles S. Fish

Reg. No. 35,870

April 8, 2009

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.

2001 Ross Avenue, Suite 600

Dallas, TX 75201-2980

(214) 953-6507

Customer Number: 35005